

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 and 42-67 remain pending in the application. Claims 1, 42 and 67 are the independent claims.

In the Official Action, dated May 20, 2005, claims 1-27 and 42-67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Paroz (US Patent No. 6,587,125) in view of Humpleman et al., or "Humpleman," (US Patent No. 6,243,707).

The outstanding rejection to the claims is respectfully traversed.

Summary of the Invention

The present invention relates generally to a method and system for providing a remote control experience **tailored to a user**, based upon a common abstracted user interface language capable of being understood by a variety of computing devices, including household appliances, and everything having a user interface for control. Since each of the abstract user interface descriptions share a common language, **a specification by the user regarding the user's preferences may be applied to each of the descriptions so that the user is always presented with a preferable user interface.** For example, a blind person may specify that he or she is blind, and a Braille user interface may be applied for each device being operated. Text may be rendered visually, by voice, by feel, etc. Different languages may also be accommodated for the same reason. Defining in a syntax only the abstract functionality necessary or common between all user interfaces thus enables the presentation of the ultimate user interface to be tailored to the user. (See Application, pages 4, line 27 to page 5, line 8)

As shown in Fig. 3, a user interacts with a universal console 200 in order to specify a set of preferences to be communicated to UC 200 along communications channel 330, which may include specifying a disability such as blindness, color blindness, etc.

As shown in Fig. 5, at 540, the UC 200 takes the stored user preferences and uses those to instantiate a concrete UI.

Paroz

In contrast, Paroz discloses a method for remotely controlling a first computing device from at least one of a plurality of second computing devices. The first computing devices has a user interface and a data communications connection to the second computing device and the second computing device is adapted to present a user interface. The method comprises analyzing the static and dynamic logic of the first computing device's user interface and creating a logically equivalent user interface in a platform-independent format for the second computing device. The equivalent user interface enables control of the first coupling device from the second computing device.

As illustrated by Figs. 1, 2, and 7 of Paroz, the second user interface running on the second computing device ("remote interface") communicates with the first computing device ("local program") via two software intermediaries: (1) a mediator software program and (2) a local server software program. The local server comprises three active software components: a window analyzer, a command executor, and a visual status monitor.

The mediator sends the second computing device a set of Dynamic Hypertext Markup Language (DHTML) or Wireless Markup Language (WML) pages, which run on the second computing device's Web browser. These pages form the second user interface by which a user can control the first computing device 17. (See Col. 8, lines 19-24)

Fig. 4 of Paroz shows the primary components of the local server 18, which runs on the first computing device. When a program is first selected by a remote user, the local server 18 activates the program (if it is not already active) and the window analyzer 34 generates a DHTML page for each layout. **The DHTML page can be customized for properties such as window size, font, language, color, refresh rate, target device, and communication protocol (e.g. HTTP, HTTP, WAP).** The window analyzer 34 can generate the DHTML pages **according to parameters such as target second computing device 10 (e.g., Palm-Pilot, Cell-Phone), communication type (e.g., modem ISDN), or target browser (e.g., Microsoft Corporation's Explorer, Netscape Corporations' Navigator).** The visual status monitor 30 monitors GUI events (e.g., windows messages) generated by the local program and updates the widges (DHTML page) running on the second computing device. (See Col. 8, line 51 to Col. 9, line 2)

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The above bolded and underlined passages highlight at least one distinction between the present invention and Paroz. In particular, with the invention, **a user interacts with a universal console (UC) 200 to specify a set of preferences, and the set of preferences is stored in the UC 200.** Thus, when UC 200 instantiates a concrete user interface (UI) the **UC 200 takes and uses the stored user preferences to instantiate a concreted UI**, and the user is therefore presented with a user-preferable interface.

Paroz, however, does not disclose any user interaction for specifying, or storing, user preferences to be taken into account when a second computing device instantiates a concrete UI (e.g., a DHTML page). Although Paroz discloses customizing the DHTML pages (e.g., for properties such as window size, font, language, color, refresh rate, target device, and

communication protocol), the customization of DHTML pages is done by the window analyzer 34 according to parameters such as target second computing device, communication type, or target browser, on a DHTML-page-by-DHTML-page basis. There is no disclosure of *user interaction to specify and store* user preferences that may be taken into account in generating DHTML pages. In short, neither user interaction for specifying user preferences nor storing of user preferences is taught or suggested by Paroz.

Therefore, in combination with all of the other elements of the claims, Paroz cannot be considered to teach or suggest “wherein **said UC generates a concrete UI description from said canonical UI and said stored user preferences,**” as recited in claim 42.

Likewise, Paroz cannot be said to teach or suggest “**instantiating a concrete UI by the UC taking into account the stored at least one user preference,**” as recited in claim 1; or similarly cannot be said to teach or suggest “means for **instantiating a concrete UI by the UC taking into account the stored at least one user preference,**” as recited in claim 67.

Humpleman

Humpleman discloses a method and system for commanding and controlling diverse home devices connected to a home network. According to the method, sequences of commands which are used to control a home device are stored as a macro to control the home device. A sequence of commands, used to control a plurality of home devices in tandem, is stored as a macro. The user is provided a capability of operating a single button to implement a sequence of control commands from within a HTML page contained on the respective home devices being controlled.

In this regard, Humpleman was cited for its disclosure of “using a predefined user interface,” at col.11 lines 50-col. 12 line 3, and is purportedly related to other aspects of the

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0302/167451.01
Application No.: 09/775,033
Office Action Dated: May 20, 2005

PATENT

claims also not taught by Paroz. Without conceding the propriety of the combination, however, Applicants respectfully submit that Humpleman does not cure the above-identified deficiency of root reference Paroz with respect to the claims. Namely, Humpleman also cannot be said to teach or suggest "wherein said UC generates a concrete UI description from said canonical UI and said stored user preferences," as recited in claim 42, and similarly in claims 1 and 67.

Accordingly, claims 1, 42 and 67 are believed allowable over Paroz and Humpleman, whether taken alone or in combination. Claims 2-27 and 43-66 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and 42, respectively, and are believed allowable for the same reasons. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1-27 and 42-67 patentably define over Paroz. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-27 and 42-67 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is thus earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the present Remarks are responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Official Action, and submit that Claims 1-27 and 42-67 of the application are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and passage to issue of the application at the Examiner's earliest convenience is earnestly solicited.

Date: August 17, 2005



Thomas E. Watson
Registration No. 43,243

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439